Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0909CA-1 for Montebello Unified School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD's response in this section addresses only Core Assurance Area 1, and 2. Key goals for Core Assurance Areas 3 and 4 are included in Section (A)(4). Thus the score for this section is at the mid-level of the medium range. MUSDs failure to address all four Core Assurance areas in this section has impacted the coherence of its stated vision.

The district vision is to create and sustain a personalized learning environment for every child in the district and to ensure each child's preparation for college and career. Its vision is to create a school environmnet that recognizes the strength of individuals, the value of positive relationships, educational equity, high expectations, college and career readiness, rigor, and relevance.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fully addressed all criteria in this section. The score for this section is thus at the upper level of the high range. The schools selected to participate in the grant were selected by a RTT District Grant committee composed of members of The Framework Design Committee based on students' needs, capacity for success and sustainability. The proposal's target population of participating schools fit in the specific grade span of 6-10 and are high needs students, eligible for free and reduced lunch, are English Learners and/or Long Term English Learners, and/or have a Special Education designation.

MUSD provided the list of schools initially selected for participation. They are: Grades 6-8 Bell Gardens Intermediate, Eastmont Intermediate, La Merced Intermediate, Macy Intermediate, Montebello Intermediate, Suva Intermediate, Rosewood Park School; Grades 9-10 Bell Gardens High School, Montebello High School, Schurr High School, Vail Continuation High School and the Applied Technology Center.

12,115 students will be participating in this project. 10,419 (86%) of these students are high needs, 10,164 (84%) are children from low-income families.

There are 703 participating educators in this project.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

While MUSD describes the initiatives currently underway in the district that are aimed at increasing student learning, providing personalized learning, and enhancing the relevancy of the school to students the response does not make clear how these initiatives will be influenced by this project. This section scored at the lower level of the medium range.

MUSD does not address how it plans to scale up grant activities beyond vague statements such as, "*The alliance forged with The Leadership and Learning Center in 2011, allows us to further academic achievement outcomes for all students throughout the MUSD*" and "*The district will be transformed through the use of the Comprehensive Learning Framework (CLF) as a system for school improvement*."

MUSD has not provided in its response the required elements of the high quality plan to scale up this project into district wide reform, lacking key goals, strategies, rationale for those strategies, timelines, deliverables, and who will be responsible for implementation required by the criteria in this section.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did not meet the requirements of the criteria in this section. While MUSD provided performance data as required it did not provide the methodology used to calculate annual goals.   This section scored at the lower level of the medium range.

MUSD included summative assessment data for students in grades 6-10 in ELA and mathematics (actuals for 2010-11 and 2011-12, and projections to 2015-16), as well as data from the California Assessment of High School Exit Exams (CAHSEE) in ELA and Math – passing rates on first attempt. Also provided were charts showing goals for decreasing the achievement gaps for sub-group populations, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates. The school district also includes growth rates calculated by the state of California.

Because the narrative does explain the methodology used to calculate annual performance targets it is not possible to determine if the performance targets provided are equal to or exceed State SEA targets for the LEA, overall and by student subgroup.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	2

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did not meet the requirements for the criteria in subsections (a), (b), or (c). This section scored at the mid-level of the low range.

(a) The district did not provide sufficient evidence to establish a clear record of success in advancing student learning. MUSD, in its narrative, stated that it has made significant progress in raising the Academic Performance Index scores (API), Annual Measurable Achievement Objective targets for English Language Learners Reclassification data (RFEP), Graduation rates, Early Assessment Readiness data in English, Special Ed data. However, no data was provided showing student performance over the past four years except for a single chart showing "re-normed" annual measurable objectives for its English learner population, in which MUSD did not meet the AMO target in 3 of the last 4 years.

(b) MUSD did not provide sufficient evidence that it made ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools. The only data provided addressing this criterion is that MUSD has been in "District Improvement" status for the past 10 years and all middle schools are currently in "program improvement" status.

(c) The district did not address this crierion.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD provided insufficient information in its response to meet these criteria. It scored at the upper level of the low range.

MUSD reported only that California requires all public schools to provide an annual accountability report which includes important information about each school. That report is then posted on the district web-site for parent and community review. Included among the bulleted list of what is included in the report is a reference to "fiscal and expenditure data." Except for this brief reference, no additional information is provided about what is included in the fiscal and expenditure data provided.

The information provided by MUSD in this section is insufficient to demonstrate the applicant has met the requirements of (B)(1)(a-d).

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district has fully and comprehensively addressed the criteria in this section. This section scored at the high level of the upper range.

MUSD has provided references to statutory or regulatory authority providing sufficient autonomy to implement reform required

in each of the four core assurance areas. Additionally it has provided evidence, in the form of excerpts of a November 21, 2011 letter signed by California Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr.; California Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson; and California President, State Board of Education Michael W. Kirst to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education, stating the California will comply with all of the accountability, transparency, and reporting requirements that apply to the Race to the Top program.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	3

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did not meet the requirements of subsection (a) and partially met the requirements of subsection (b).   It scored in the lower level of the medium range.

MUSD engaged in a communications strategy aimed with stakeholders to gather feedback on the application. MUSD staff

- Surveyed students in grades 6 through 10 at each school
- Presented to parents about the grant, at meetings of the School Site Council at each school
- Presented to the District Advisory Council and District English Learners
- Posted a PowerPoint describing the grant proposal on the district's website
- Met with the Montebello Teacher's Association, the bargaining body that represents Montebello teachers in a town hall style meeting about the grant
- Utilized meetings of the Instructional Services Division to provide updates on the application and writing process. Each department Director communicated the information back to their department staff member·
- Provided updates and solicited input on grant progress at weekly Division Head meetings
- Presented the proposal to the Mayor's Committee for Strengthening Community and District Partnerships

The district did not address the requirements of (B)(4)(a)(i-ii) by providing either:

> (i) For LEAs with collective bargaining representation, evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools (as defined in this notice); or

> (ii) For LEAs without collective bargaining representation, at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools (as defined in this notice) support the proposal

Just 2 letters of support were provided by MUSD as part of this application:

- The District English Language Arts advisory committee composed of parents from each school who represent the English learner populations at those schools
- The District Advisory Committee composed of parents from each school who represent the economically and socially disadvantaged populations at each school

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The district's response to this section is incomplete. It has therefore scored at the lower level of the low range.

The response did not address how it proposed to determine its current status in implementing the personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal contained in MUSD's proposal. MUSD provides information about the current performance of students in summative assessments, and about the software platform the district is using to store and match student and teacher information to state testing results and progress monitoring via formative assessments. It also provided information about MUSD's Edusoft platform used to identify needs and gaps for individual students. Neither of these descriptions addressed the criteria of this section.

The response also does not address the requirements of this section that the district describe its high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the applicant's proposal, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address. Components of a high quality plan that are not provided include: include key goals, strategies, rationale for those strategies, timelines, deliverables and who will be responsible for implementing each of the strategies

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD succinctly describes well thought-out, comprehensive, and research based goals to address the requirements of this section. For each goal, several key strategies and a rationale for that goal and strategies is also provided.   However MUSD's response lacks the elements required in the high-quality plan called for by the criteria. It is thus scored at the mid-level of the medium range.

MUSD project goals articulated in this section include:

- Rigorous Curriculum Design
- Common Core standards and critical thinking skills
- Career Pathways
- Differentiated lessons
- Authentic real world projects
- School site Data Teams
- Learning goals linked to college and career-ready standards·Settings that provide alternatives for English learners to use their dominant language
- A seal of Biliteracy (Spanish, Mandarin, Armenian, French, Japanese), which includes multicultural traditions within the district's programs
- Personalized sequence of instructional
- content and skill development
- High quality strategies adapted via formative assessments for high need students to ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards
- Partnerships with organizations/educational institutions/outside providers

However, the high-quality plan required in this section also calls for timelines, deliverables, and the persons who will be responsible for implementing those strategies. These elements are missing from the narrative. Without these elements the response fails to illustrate how the many the goals and activities will fit together into a coordinated *system* of expectations and supports.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did not meet all of the requirements of the criteria in this section.   It is thus scored at the upper level of the lower range.

As proposed, the plan includes three major concepts:

1.   Data analysis

2.   Personalization for needs

3.   Certification for leadership and learning

The Data analysis section is non-responsive to the criteria of this section. It describes two kinds of data that will be collected as part of this project (effect data and cause data) but not how that data will be analyzed or used to by teachers to improve learning, by leaders to improve teaching, or by district staff to improve programs.

The second section entitled "Personalization for Needs" is not responsive to the criteria, stating in whole, "*Teachers will establish their own goals for the year, but also their own goals with the student, based upon where they are on the learning continuum. Teachers, working with their content area strengths, articulate goals individually for students one by one. Teachers assist students to write their own learning goals. The teacher scaffolds the students to move them to a deeper level of knowledge. Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK) guides the understanding of content area literacy and proficiency in literacy and math and informs teachers as they strive to achieve levels of rigor, which prepare students to achieve in college and career.*"

In the third section, entitled "Certification for leadership and learning" but the only narrative describing this goal states "*The data teams build capacity to implement this reform. Grant funding would be used to provide three days of professional*

development as well as extensive follow up. In order for teachers to effectively improve their instruction, intervention is needed in the form of coaching, professional development, and other areas as well. These activities will require substantial release time, salaries, fees for coaches, and substitutes for teachers who will be participating in professional development activities."

The remainder of the Certification for leadership and learning section discusses the current status of the MUSD teacher, principal and classified staff member evaluation system and a number of other topics including the current status of each evaluation system and how the district is working with its unions to revise that existing system. However it does not contain a coherent plan for certification for leadership and learning.

In addition, this section lacks the high quality implementation plan required by the criteria. Missing are key goals, activities, the rationale for those activities, timelines, deliverables and identification of the person who will be responsible for implementing the activities.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	2

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD does not provide convincing evidence that these criteria have been, or will be, met. It scored at the upper level of the low range.

MUSD asserts that it will give the schools "flexibility and autonomy to effect the necessary improvements." However the only description contained in the narrative is a charge from the district to school leadership teams to "*create a curriculum pacing calendar for implementing units of study to ensure that all Priority Standards will be taught, assessed, retaught, and reassessed throughout the school year, prior to administration of the state tests. The number of days or weeks designated for each unit of study will be adjusted so that all units can be completed during the months leading up to the high-stakes tests. A "buffer" week will be factored between units for the purpose of re-teaching and reassessing close-to-proficient students, intervening and reassessing far-from-proficient students, and enriching proficient and above students. The pacing calendar will be extended to schedule the remaining units of study during the month of June following the state tests.*"

The narrative does not address the requirements of (D)(1)(b-e)

MUSD's response lacks key elements of the required high quality plan including goals, key activities, rationale for those activities, timelines, deliverables the person responsible for implementing the activities.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD's response to this subsection does not sufficiently address or meet the criteria. It scored at the upper level of the low range.

MUSD states that personalized learning in the district is supported by two entities:

- The Mayor's Education Roundtable (whose mission it is to promote a partnership between the school district, individual schools and the cities served by the Montebello Unified School District), and
- The Friends of the Montebello Unified School District (whose mission is to support strong economic health and vitality for the communities and to provide quality educational opportunities for young people and adults which will help reverse negative workforce trends in California and secure California's economic future)

It is not explained in the narrative the purpose for mentioning either of these groups or how their work with MUSD assists the district in meeting the criteria of this section.

The second section of the narrative is a series of definitions of types of professional learning. No tie is provided between the definitions and the work underway at MUSD.

MUSD's response lacks key elements of the required high quality plan including goals, key activities, rationale for those activities, timelines, deliverables the person responsible for implementing the activities.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**1**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD's response is not adequate to meet, or address, the criteria in this section. It is scored at the lower level of the low range.

MUSD's response to this section appears to contain the a series of notes that a writer may have wished to consult as s/he wrote the section. For example, "*The grant would fund professional development with teachers to individualize instruction and strategies for meeting the needs of subgroups. Resources could also expand the use of the programs we already use.*" The response, as written, does not respond to the criteria and does not address how MUSD will monitor and measure information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top.

There is a brief reference to Sharing information on-line but it has to do with locating additional resources as shown in the following quote from the response, "*The creation of a new department dedicated to uncovering resources for teachers and providing those to use in the classroom could increase the use of digital resources and increase the access of all students to standards aligned content through media. This would be shared on-line.*"

MUSD does not provide the high quality implementation plan required in this section. Missing elements include key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	**5**	**1**

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It appears that MUSD may have misunderstood the criteria for this section, as the majority of the narrative in this section describes an "improvement planning process" and a list of the steps that will be taken to increase student achievement and close achievement gaps. The response provided does not meet the criteria of this section. It scored at the higher level of the low range.

in its narrative in this section, MUSD very briefly refers to communications in two places. In the first, it states *"the work of the site data teams would be communicated to the district office for analysis district wide patterns and trends to guide decision-making. The work of district office data teams will be communicated from departments to cabinet level personnel. The successful implementation of data teams and the resulting increased student learning and performance will be recognized and celebrated at school and district office level."*

In the second mention of communication, this narrative refers to how "successes" were shared when the district participated in the Enhancing Education Through Technology grant. However neither of these references or any of the remaining narrative provided in this section addresses the criteria called for.

Additionally MUSD did not provide the elements of a high quality plan for on-going communicating and engagement with internal and external stakeholders, lacking the key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	**5**	**1**

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative for this section does not align with the performance measures selected, nor does it respond to the criteria included as in Section(E)(3)(a-c). Thus it scored at the upper level of the lower range.

The narrative in full states, "*Students engage in reflective, metacognitive tasks in the classroom that informs their learning and ability to guide and direct their own learning. Assessments will be rubric based, and allow students to view rubrics and assess their efforts in the context of performance goals. All teachers at the intermediate and high school are now able to use School Loop,a web-based management system, to disaggregate student grades and determine which grading areas may put students at-risk of failure in the course. The goal of being able to more quickly assess student progress and intervene for students at-risk is being met along with teachers adjusting their instruction to meet individual student needs.*"

Additionally because the MUSD did not label all of its performance measures, it is not possible to report with accuracy that these measures are aligned as shown in the box below. Because some performance measures appeared to be duplicated it is also possible that MUSD's meaning was not fully conveyed. However, it appears that there are 11 performance measures selected (See box below).

All	a. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are a highly effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and a highly effective principal (as defined in this notice); **longitudinal cohort matched data** b. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are an effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and an effective principal (as defined in this notice). **longitudinal cohort matched data**
PreK-3	a. Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate measure of students' academic growth (e.g., language and literacy development or cognition and general learning, including early mathematics and early scientific development); and b. Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate non-cognitive indicator of growth (e.g., physical well-being and motor development, or social-emotional development).
4-8	a. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice); **Decrease in suspensions - grades 6-8** b. Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan; **Pathways enrollment - grade 8, California English Language Development Test for students meeting criterion - English learners only take this test** c. Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan. **Attendance rate for grades 6-8**
9-12	a. The number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form; **FAFSA completion** b. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice); **Graduation rate grades 9-10** c. Applicant must propose at least one measure of career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students who are or are on track to being career-ready; **Perkins** d. Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan; and **California English Language Development Test for students meeting criterion - English learners only take this test** e. Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan **Attendance data for grades 9 and 10**

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

As in earlier sections it appears that the response in this section consists of notes only. These "notes" do not address the criteria nor provide the high quality plan called for in this section. This section scored at the upper level of the low range.

The response, in full, states, *"Smarter Balance is the assessment component; transitioning to implement and practice common core sate standards (CCSS)aligned instruction through Professional Development (grades TK-12) – completed internally through the district curriculum and instruction (C&I) TK12 curriculum department, in addition to professional development sourced from LACOE, Leadership and Learning is helping with the prioritization of standards and use in common formative assessments, LMU through the 9-12 CCSS transition team and in aligning standards through the CMAST grant,"*

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The budget provided fully meets the criteria of this section. It scored at the high level of the high range.

- The budget documents provided by MUSD were clear and complete
- The budget identified all funds that will support the project including non RTT funds
- The funds requested are reasonable and sufficient to support the project
- The source of all funds is described
- One time investments are apparent in the budget format

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD partially meets the requirements of the criteria in this section. The response does not include the elements required of a high quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant, and the narrative does not provide that community groups (such as the Friends of Montebello School District) are considering financial support for the activities proposed in the application following the expiration of the grant period. This section scored at the lower level of the medium range.

MUSD states that "*Financial support for sustainability will be provided from Federal and State Categorical entitlements ($10 million), and the Friends of Montebello Unified School District Foundation*" However the applicant has provided no evidence that the Friends have committed to or are even considering the financial support necessary to provide sustainability funds. MUSD also states that it is counting on additional funding support from parent groups, stating, "*MUSD will continue to build upon its extensive community support system, which include parent support groups, the Mayor's Roundtable and social/emotional community support groups.*" Once again, there is no evidence of a commitment or even consideration of this support provided.

Further MUSD asserts that, "*The Montebello Unified School District proposes a total budget of $30,000,000.00 to support teaching, learning, technology infrastructure and student, school and community access to technology for learning. This amount encompasses all funds including District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds. Grant funds will ensure complete implementation for not only the identified schools but for the entire school district. Indirect costs will cover the time and work needed to maintain the projects at the district level through finance and other supports. A combination of local and federal funds will maintain continued work at both identified schools and all other schools. Our goal is to provide the same access to training, college and career readiness, technology infrastructure, and technology device access to the entire school community. Local funds will guarantee this*." However, no evidence was provided from the potential funders of their willingness to support the grant following its term.

Additionally, MUSD's response does not include the elements of a high quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. Key elements omitted include strategies, rationale, timelines, deliverables and the person responsible for implementing the strategy.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**0**
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
Not attempted		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Not Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This application lacks the high quality planning necessary to implement a project of the complexity and score provided. Additionally it provided no evidence of:

- A track record of success in raising student achievement
- Transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments
- The LEA infrastructure necessary to carry out the project as proposed
- A viable continuous improvement process
- Communication or engagement strategies
- A process to evaluate the investments made with RTT-D funds

Total	**210**	**77**

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0909CA-2 for Montebello Unified School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**8**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Montebello Unified School District (MUSD) laid out a well-articulated comprehensive and coherent reform vision with its CLF and the process to create personalized student learning environments. MUSD implemented a Program Improvement (PI) initiative in 2000. In 2010, MUSD convened 65 stakeholders to engage in a process to develop college and career ready students with 21st century skills.

The key issues emerged from a comprehensive audit. The four key issues were the need to: develop a shared vision of what constituted deep implementation of initiatives; clear and consistent expectations of adult performance; comprehensive implementation and monitoring plans for initiatives; and the need for a districtwide, focused professional development plan.

The resulting product, the Comprehensive Learning Framework (CLF) is an very good plan that addresses these selection criteria framework. It is very good because it: includes MUSD's vision, mission, guiding principles, graduate profile, strategic improvement plan, data teams for continuous improvement, quality evaluation system, rigorous curriculum, professional development, communication plan, and roles of the guiding coalition. Rubrics, research-based options, and best practice analysis are also included in the CLF.

The one critical part missing form the plan is a timeline; the CLF states that timelines will later be developed. Without a timeline, it is difficult to assess whether MUSD has adequately scoped and sequenced its proposed programs and resulting budget and for this points were deducted. The CLF calls for that be completed after grant funds are awarded.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD's approach to reform includes a well-thought out rationale for selection of participating students and teachers that matches the grant's criteria: it targeted low-income families high-need students and educators in the schools where those students are present in the majority. They described the process used to select schools--which have a higher percentage than required of low income students. Eleven intermediate (middle) and high schools were chosen, and grades 6 through 10 were targeted for student and teacher programs.   Of the 12,115 participating students, 86% are high need, 85% are low income; 703 teachers are included.

The reform proposal includes successfully scaled up and new online targeted interventions that are appropriate for the defined middle and high school students. MUSD also includes a variety of programs for these students, including pathways, ELL-focused, special-needs-focused across all subject areas.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD's CLF is a high-quality plan written for all district grade levels. This grant is focused on interventions and programs for grade 6-10 students, yet MUSD has wisely positioned this grant application as a means to accelerate improvement throughout the district. To that end, the MUSD specifically plans to have participating teachers mentor non-participating teachers, and expand use of grant-funded professional development processes and content to the entire district. MUSD articulates that it has targeted specific schools so that RTTD funds will enhance student performance as students move through feeder patterns. It also planning for special education teacher training to improve teacher retention post-grant. MUSD has done a very good job of strategically planning for long-term growth.

The one missing aspect of the plan is a timeline for scaling reform throughout the district. Without a timeline, it is difficult to assess whether MUSD has adequately scoped and sequenced its plan and points were deducted. The CLF calls for timelines to be completed after grant funds are awarded.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD's expected improvement of performance on several summative assessments and decreasing achievement gaps seem unrealistic based on the difference between 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 actual performance. For example, overall AYP ELA scores districtwide decreased .2 points in 2011-12, but are expected to rise 5.6 points in 2012-13. Correspondingly,closure of achievement gaps in ELA appear unrealistic because they do not follow the pattern of past improvement and no new targeted strategies were articulated. No specific explanation is given as to why MUSD expects the projected increases in ELA scores. Districtwide math is in line with increases this past year.

Graduation rates appear realistic and supported by the plan. College enrollment estimates were provided, but no longitudinal data were provided so this cannot be assessed.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The data MUSD provided did not provide a clear record of success for the past 4 years.

MUSD provided an 11-year (2000 to 2012) record in its Academic Improvement Index (API) which is a statewide metric for student gains in academic achievement (incorporating both achievement gains and gap closing. But unexplained decreases in student achievement were portrayed in that evidence.

For its lowest performing ELL students, MUSD's AMAO ranking was shown for the period 2006-2012. It dipped in 2006-07 and rose for 3 years, then dipped again and rose dramatically last year. Incomplete information was provided to understand the variations.

Data are made available to students for the Early Assessment of College Readiness (EAP), but measures only for 2012 were presented making it impossible to assess improvement.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did not address the specific criteria for this section. Its narrative for this section only described required information for the state school report card which includes "teacher and staff information" (no details about what information) and "fiscal and expenditure data" -- without details about whether that data addresses (a), (b), (c) or (d) in this section.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD provided an very good demonstration that it has sufficient autonomy and successful conditions in the state of California to implement the personalized learning environments described. It stated that it specifically has the authority to also implement supporting structures, including teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluations; comprehensive college course preparation; transcipt analyses; and robust data system implementation. Furthermore, the state's Governor and Superintendent of Public Instruction, and President of the Board of Education have already assured in writing to the DOE (11-21-11 letter) that the state will fully comply with all RTT requirements.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did not provide any evidence that (a) (i) or (ii) was completed. Educator and leader involvement in the plan's development is an important requirement for this grant and this is a serious ommission.

MUSD did, however, provide support that it engaged other stakeholders in the development of this proposal, including:

- Students: surveyed in grades 6-10 through Associated Student Body Councils
- Parents: each participating School Site Council, District Advisory Council, and District English Learners Advisory Council viewed RTT-D information and commented
- Montebello Teacher's Association (MTA): participated in Town Hall Meeting regarding the proposal, co-wrote the CLF plan and met monthly from Jan 2012 to present
- MUSD Directors, Division Heads: meet on weekly bases and given regular updates
- Mayor's Committee: received information and endorsed application

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The CLF, the high-quality plan supporting the entire proposal, contains the very good, specific steps used to analyze needs and gaps for students in every one of its identified target groups and subgroups. Further, the MUSD identifies the following data sources in its proposal that will be used to continuously monitor students needs and create student portfolios: teacher subscriptions to Edusoft to identify individual student needs and gaps, CAHSEE, CST, CELDT, and other formative assessments. MUSD is already piloting new online formative assessments.

MUSD also provided very high-quality, detailed plans for evaluating and monitoring student needs and gaps for the following programs and measurements:

- Applied Technology Center
- Pathways
- School Loop
- Data Teams and Common Core State Standards
- AMAO measures

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD's plan did not contain all the information necessary to adequately address this section's criteria. It did not specifically address (b) (iv) and (v) or (c) so no assessment of those sections can be made.

MUSD did, however, articulate specific approaches to implementing instructional strategies for all participating student groups:

- English Learners
- Poverty
- Far below grade level
- Drop out
- Homeless
- Foster care
- Incarcerated
- Disabled
- High minority

MUSD described communication and data-sharing plans with teachers, students, and parents to satisfy that students will Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards; ave access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives already within MUSD; master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving through personalized learning systems that incorporate a variety of learning methods and approaches.

To assure students are long term learners, MUSD proposes to work with future aspects of learning--colleges and career pathway employers who can provide feedback to the process -- but it did not identify an employer selection process in this proposal thus making it difficult to assess if it would be successful.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	9

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did not fully address the criteria in this section. Missing were: evidence that school educators and principals support the practices outlined (which will be crucial to implementation); information to support (c); and convincing evidence that (a) will occur with Lead Learners in place at schools.

MUSD proposes to analyze teacher/principal data to determine causes and effects of high quality instruction and leading.

MUSD will assess the following components in its evaluation system, but it did not provide adequate information that it can create high-quality tools to support these new components:

- empowerment
- common language
- summative and evaluative assesment
- objectives
- timelines
- rubrics
- well defined levels of performance to enhance improvement

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**4**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD provided insufficient information to assess school flexibility (they only stated that a pacing calendar would allow extra classes in June and did not address school team flexibility. MUSD did not address changes in current governance process which appears in other sections to be hierarchical.

Adaptable resources and practices for ELL and students with disabilities were described in another section. Limited information about how students would be able to show mastery at multiple times was provided, however, students will be provided multiple ways to pursue mastery (pathways, online programs).

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**1**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD described community partnerships and effective professional development/learning standards, but did not address parent, student, and educator access to learning resources, technical support, or interoperable data systems with exportable information.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**8**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did address many parts of a continuous improvement system (see next paragraph), but did not address at all the most critical: a feedback loop within the system and significant points were deducted for this omission.

MUSD describes in-depth in its proposal and its CLF how it will support continuous improvement in "adult" behavior to stimulate student achievement. The proposal and CLF describe how teacher Data Teams at each school will receive considerable support, tools and rubrics, and training in order to foster an environment of continuous improvement on each campus. The CLF also outlined a Planning, Implementation, Monitoring (RIM) rubric to spur continuous improvement. Evaluation of effectiveness will be shared with all stakeholders. MUSD also described RtI associated with the Reading First program.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	**5**	**1**

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A communication plan is outlined in MUSD's CLF, however, this section of the proposal does not present evidence of what communication vehicles would be used or targeted to specific stakeholder groups.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did not completely address all the required categories to satisfy the criteria of this section. It did not provide its rationale for each measure, nor how it specifically would review and report its success. Below is a summary of what was and was not reported.

Applicable Population	Performance Measure

All	All subgroups (6-10): state assessment and attendance to be measured.
4-8	No specific CCR on-track measure indicated (some rationale for Pathways, but very few students affected), assumption that decreases in suspension and attendance are social emotional indicators (40 Developmental assets were mentioned in another section, but not shown to be used)
9-12	FAFSA completion was not addressed, but college readiness (graduation with CA credentials) and areer readiness (CTE participation rates) were indicated. No social emotional measures, unless attendance was intended to be one (no rationale provided)

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The measures of investment effectiveness that MUSD included did not address all the criteria for this section. Additionally, the information provided by MUSD does not outline elements of a high-quality continuous improvement plan, including a timeline, roles and responsibilities, and feedback loops for the various programs mentioned.

MUSD states that it plans to use as-yet-unavailable SmarterBalance formative assessments to evaluate instructional effectiveness. It plans to provide PD so that school Data Teams will be able to analyze data, but no specific data analysis process is defined. Reports to stakeholders are planned, but the aspects that will be reported are not fully addressed.

And, MUSD did not address strategies for several critical effectiveness metrics: technology improvement, compensation reform, or modification of school schedules,

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD states that other funds (federal entitlements, Friends of MUSD Foundatiuon, parent support, and Mayor's Roundtable) will be used, but no amounts were included in the overall budget summary.

Rationale for the 11 projects budgeted (web-based tools for 6-8; curricular integration of technology; middle school math teacher content learning; instructional technology PD; Data Team coaching; lesson design training; Pathways; CTE learning teams, and intermediate LAC PD) was provided.

The budget skews mostly toward curricular-focused support in rigor and use of technology, which is good. The budget narratives for each project were complete, but expenses for travel did not have any details.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MUSD did not provide a separate narrative section on how it would sustain the program. It does state: "The budget projects included in this document are designed to build the capacity of teachers and administrators to sustain the grant goals after the term has expired. Financial support for sustainability will be provided from Federal and State Categorical entitlements ($10 million), and the Friends of Montebello Unified School District Foundation."

In two other sections it vaguely states: "The Comprehensive Learning Framework is designed to maintain the district's focus on student achievement even when changes occur in personnel and policy."

However, this is not a high-quality plan for sustainability. There is no evidence provided that Friends of MUSD Foundation nor federal entitlements (limited to specific spending rules) could provide significant funding to continue development of data systems and continuous improvement of personalized student environments.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**0**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Section was not completed.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

With its CLF, MUSD articulates a process to create personalized student learning environments to improve student achievement of MUSD's college and career readiness goals. The CLF includes MUSD's vision, mission, guiding principles, graduate profile, strategic improvement plan, data teams for continuous improvement, quality evaluation system, rigorous curriculum, professional development for educators and school leaders, communication plan, and roles of the guiding coalition. Rubrics, research-based options, and best practice analysis are also included.

In 2010, MUSD convened 65 stakeholders to engage in a process to develop college and career ready students with 21st century skills.   Four key issues that emerged from a comprehensive audit were addressed in this proposal: develop a shared vision of what constituted deep implementation of initiatives; clear and consistent expectations of adult performance; comprehensive implementation and monitoring plans for initiatives; and the need for a districtwide, focused professional development plan.

	Available	Score
Total	**210**	**105**

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0909CA-3 for Montebello Unified School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**8**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Montebello Unified School District began work on a district-wide vision to improve the educational environment for learning and prepare students for college and career two years ago. Since that time, they have utilized both internal and external stakeholders to develop a graduate profile and mission and vision for the district as well as a Comprehensive Learning Framework (CLF). The stakeholders involved in the development of the CLF include 65 individuals from schools (teachers and principals), academic specialists, the district office, parents, and a Board member. Ample evidence is provided to illustrate that the district has a plan to deepen student learning and increase equity that involves personalized student support and

interests.

The reform vision does not adequately describe how the district will build on work accomplished in three of the four core educational assurance areas: (a) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction, (b) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and (c) turning around lowest-achieving schools. While these assurance areas are addressed elsewhere in the proposal, their absence leaves the vision less comprehensive.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Montebello's proposal includes 11 of their 29 schools: four of five high schools, all six intermediate schools, and a sixth school that includes grades 6-8: 39% of the total district population. The selection of the participant schools was made by the Race to the Top District Grant committee composed of members of the Framework Design Committee. The team determined school criteria for participation (students' needs, capacity for success and sustainability), and target population (grades 6-10, high needs, low income, English learners, Special Education). Rationale is provided for the selection of the transition years of grades 6 through 9, the need for student success in Algebra 1 in grades 8 and 9, and the academic needs of all intermediate schools to move each from Program Improvement status. Details are provided, as well, to support the need for professional development for middle school teachers who, due to state budget cuts, are teaching in areas out of their focus area. This need is particularly strong in math and science.

The proposal refers to the RTTT District Grant committee as the decision-maker in determining the participant schools and the scope of the reform, but does not offer any details on the specific composition on the makeup of this committee, if it includes school and parent representatives, and the level of its independence from the district office. It is not clear as to why one of the five high schools has been omitted from participation and the type of school represented by Rosewood Park (all students are participating and yet it is not an intermediate school). It is unlikely, as shown on the chart, that all of the low-income students within the district (column E) are enrolled within the target schools and none I the remaining 61% of the schools. Similarly, the narrative notes that 78% of the target group will be low-income students; the chart reveals 85%. There is a lack of some consistency.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal offers a district-wide vision from the beginning, with a focus on high need populations in grades 6-10 at selected schools for this initiative.   Outcome goals are included that are aligned with the graduate profile (students as critical thinkers, communicators, collaborators, and creators) and direct all staff to: (a) prepare students at every level for college and career, (b) engage in continuous learning to assist college and career efforts, (c) maintain safe and innovative learning environments, (d) engage parents and community in student learning, and (e) align funds to support student learning. Numerous approaches are mentioned that have the potential to improve student learning outcomes such as student opportunities to provide teachers feedback about their learning, student access to the rubrics upon which their assessments are determined, and that students will develop their own learning goals. The Comprehensive Learning Framework provides a direction for the district that will include the increased rigor in curriculum and collegial mentoring among teachers.

The application does not offer a clearly stated theory of change or logic model that follows inputs through short- and long-term outputs. The supporting narrative is often fragmented and unclear as to whether it refers to a long-term district-wide vision or the more focused intermediate and high school program within the proposal.

The outcomes goals as stated all represent what the district staff will accomplish. Earlier, the Comprehensive Learning Framework Guiding Principles focus, primarily, on operational and management processes. The reform and vision, while focused on students, retains the traditional separation of student and teacher - of who teaches whom and who learns from whom.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The charts of annual goals illustrate anticipated increases in English/Language Arts and Mathematics scores on the CST and the CAHSEE for every participant grade for each program year and the year beyond. Generally the increases are incremental and achievable for each of the subgroups identified. Expectations for English learners are, percentage-wise, extremely ambitious. Examples include ELA in grades 6 through 8 where percentages for proficient and above are expected to move in the years 2011-12 to 2012-13 from 5.2% to 14.7%, 6.4% to 15.8%, and 3.2% to 12.9%, respectively. This optimism holds true for this subgroup in Math as well. No information is provided as to why this subgroup would expect to increase achievement

at this high rate over one year. and even to continue a high percentage increase for several years thereafter.

The annual goals provided for graduation and college enrollment by subgroup show steady increases throughout the program. This regular increase appears at the end of 2012-13 school year when little, if any of the programming has had an opportunity to be fully implemented. College enrollment, in fact, shows its highest increase between the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years: more than any full year of grant programming, even after the students in 9th and 10th grade would have graduated from high school and at least registered for Fall college classes.

In addition to the annual goals, the proposal includes action areas built around the four reform goals to support improved outcomes. Details are provided around each of the core assurance areas: (1) standards and assessments for college- and career readiness, (2) data systems for improving teaching and learning, (3) building and sustaining leadership, and (4) turning around low-achieving schools. It is not clear which of the directives within these areas are focused on the participant grades and schools (grades 6-10) and which are district and/or school wide.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**5**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Three tables are presented to support the applicant's record of success in advancing student learning and achieving and increasing equity. Following a clear explanation of terminology, these tables illustrate AMAO (Annual Measurable Achievable Objective) targets for English Language Learners. Due to the gray scale in the available copy, the results can only be interpreted from the narrative copy which indicates an improvement in district performance. One table offers a six-year span of data while the other two are limited to two years.

The narrative refers to 11th-grade student success on the Early Assessment of Readiness for College in English (EAP), although no data is provided. The results from this assessment are available to students and the parents, in addition to teachers and the California State University, to understand the student's level of preparation for university work.

Minimal evidence is provided to support student success over the past four years, such as closing the achievement gap, increases in graduation gap and/or increases in college enrollment. No information is provided on the district's specific reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or even if the schools selected for participation represent the lowest performing.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In order to meet California state requirements, each school within the Montebello Unified School District prepares and distributes to parents and the greater community a School Accountability Report Card (SARC). The SARC includes key information about each school, including fiscal and expenditure data. The proposal does not provide any additional details as to what fiscal and expenditure data is included, such as specifics on monies for pupil support, school administration, or regular K-12 instruction. No description is provided regarding how the district makes information available about school level expenditures from State and local funds on: (a) actual personnel salaries for school-level instructional and support staff, (b) actual personnel salaries for instructional staff only, (c) actual personnel salaries for teachers only, and (d) actual non-personnel expenditures, if available.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

There is no evidence that any State legal, statutory, or regulatory requirement would prove to be a barrier to program implementation. The proposal addresses principal and teacher evaluations, student progress monitoring against college- and career-ready graduation requirements, and other plan elements, none of which present challenges to legal precedents.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	**10**	**2**

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A powerpoint presentation on the grant opportunity was prepared and presented to parents members of the School Site

Council; at the district level, members of the District Advisor Council and the District English Learners Advisory Council also reviewed this information. No information is provided as to whether or not questions were raised or if any conversations occurred that influenced the development of the proposal.

Questions and answers were a part of an informational Town Hall-style meeting with the Mountebello Teacher's Association, the bargaining body that represents Montebello teachers. No record is provided regarding the impact or influence of either.

While vague, it appears that the chief architects of the development of the proposal are members of an RTTT District Grant Committee/Framework Design Team Subcommittee that began to work with Directors in the Instructional Services Division during the summer. No details are provided on who served on this team and if it included multiple stakeholders or not. No information is provided in the proposal of how any individual members were engaged in the development of the proposal, including any students, families, teachers, or principals. The only specifics available are that Instructional Services Division Directors met weekly from July through October for grant progress updates and to provide input. These Directors, in turn, communicated this information to their respective staffs. No feedback loop is documented.

Montebello does have collective bargaining representation and the application includes evidence of direct engagement from their leadership. The statement included in the application is a Tentative Agreement to form a committee for the purpose of revising and reviewing evaluation procedures; they hope to do so by May 1, 2013. The head of the Teachers Association did sign this agreement although failed to sign the Application Assurances.

Five mayors and the California Department of Education were provided with the proposal for comment; all declined to comment. Two copies of the form submitted by Mayor Frank Gomez, however, are enclosed, one marked that the comment is attached and the other that the comment is declined. The page provided as the Mayor's comment is unlikely to have come from the Mayor's office, however.

Stakeholder engagement was not supported by letters of support.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The school district offers a plan to analyze their current status of implementation based on: (a) the use of data from student assessment portfolios developed as data warehouses for state assessments by Edusoft, (b) comprehensive reports and a complete picture of student performance due to the triangulation of data made available through Edusoft's system, (c) new access through the New Tech Network systems that will follow the use of communication portals for personalized instruction and other stages of project implementation, (d) data from the Pathways program specific to student achievement and college and career success, (e) School Loop, and (f) records of success of success on the implementation of PLCs/Data Teams and the Common Core State Standards.

The narrative addresses some identified needs and gaps (academic needs for Socio-economically Disadvantaged and English-language learners), but does not tie their identification to analysis completed as part of any plan.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district provides a lengthy description of an improved learning and teaching environment for all students. The description informally covers several of the 11 separate projects for which individual budgets are included as part of the application. These projects include areas such as: (a) Rigorous Curriculum Design for all students, and (b) Pathways, with three separate learning opportunities for students. Both seek to implement approaches to facilitate the academic course of study for participant students to advance into college-and career readiness. Support for both of these projects is appropriately included in the narrative, with significant details for the Pathways to College and Career Success project.

The proposal does not provide, however, a clear and well-defined plan that improves learning, for all students or for those at participant schools, by personalizing the learning environment. Details on the majority of the11 projects are only provided at the budget level; narrative descriptions general omit the essential specifics of who, when, how, and where. Statements of the existence of high-quality instructional approaches and environments that ensure a personalized learning experience for every student are listed but either not- or not-thoroughly documented (i.e., "These approaches include: digital learning, flexible schedules, formative assessments, online interactive learning forums, integration of technology at every level…"). The

discussion of the Rigorous Curriculum Design project states that it will address and meet the diverse needs of all district students and will be used as the instructional basis; a description of the curriculum follows. The description of the project provided in the budget section, however, covers two weeks of substitutes each program year for 80 teachers so that the teachers can develop units of study that ensure implementation of a rigorous curriculum plus another 160 hours each of four years (presumably during the summer) of professional development for 80 teachers, again to create units of study. No direction is provided as to academic content, work through academic departments, needs of individual schools, or even needs of individual students.

Parent involvement and communication will be among the indicators of program success. The plan will use the Teleparent and School loop to maintain constant and relevant communication with parents and student family members. The Data Team process is strengthened by the development of relationships throughout the school community, including the participation of parents as they relate to students, teachers, administrators, and the schools.

While evidence is presented as to why students should be involved, through a personalized learning environment, in the identification of learning and development goals and with the pursuit of those goals as linked to college- and career readiness, the narrative does not clarify why this should be the case. The proposal includes a quotation that sums up the situation: "Teachers must incorporate explicit procedures into their daily operations for how students should respond during he learning process…"

All students in participant schools (middle- and high-school level) will be involved in the Pathways program that offers a personalized sequence of instructional content as students, their parents, and their counselors work together to develop a plan that best suits the long-term interests and skills of the student and graduate on time and college- and career-ready. Content will include digital learning (online interactive learning forums).   The plan does not provide reference to digital learning or personalization through the use of online courses, either locally, within the state, or across the nation.

Feedback is provided by the school site Data Teams (all school site administrators, teachers and counselors). These teams will provide teachers with observations and feedback on their instructional delivery. Other evidence of the positive use of feedback includes the encouragement of immediate student feedback on in-class assignments that can be of use to teachers. These feedback opportunities, however, are not organized. They do not represent formal opportunities to impact the logic model of the plan to make thoughtful revisions to better meet the overall project goal of a more personalized environment leading to accelerating student achievement, and deepening student learning.

The proposal includes high-quality strategies and accommodations for high-need students to ensure that they are on track, that include: (a) satellite classes for students who have dropped out of school, (b) flexible schedules for learning for homeless students, (c) establish and expand a partnership with government case workers to monitor student progress for students in foster care, and (d) peer coaching and Reciprocal Teaching for English learners.   Among the listing of high-need are categories for both poverty and high minority. Strategies and accommodations for both of these populations include extended learning double period-core/intervention, and Saturday academies. These interventions are appropriate for students who fit within the "far below grade level" category.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal provides insight into the way that all district educators will analyze data: the relationship between the effect data (objective outcomes and results such as graduation rates and test scores) and cause data (subjective actions such as the depth of implementation of professional development or performance-based strategies). While this may provide a useful tool for educators, no further information is provided as to how educators should interpret their findings, assign weight to effect and cause elements, and change practice as a result of the results.

All teachers will be part of site Data Teams that provide feedback to teachers. They will each establish their own goals annually and work with each individual student, by content area, to establish learning goals that deepen students' level of knowledge and better prepare them for the rigor expected in both college and career.

The narrative does not discuss how educators increase their capacity to adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in respect to their academic needs, interests, and learning approaches. Only one of the 11 projects described within the budget narrative focuses on professional development (Project 4: Teacher professional Development on Curricular Instructional Technology Integration). This project supports 435 teachers to each attend a five-day instructional technology integration academy and participate in an additional 12 hours of ongoing training and professional development to support the key elements of "deep implementation of the grant objectives."   It is unclear as to whether the 435 teachers are all teachers at participant schools and, if so, which schools and how they are selected. The 12 additional hours of professional development are not identified as focusing on content, process, personalization, or any other specific element of the project or the plan.

The district's evaluation systems for classified, teacher, and administrative employees is expected to provide individual and collective feedback that will use multiple measures and promote support growth for the individual being evaluated, and result in useful collective feedback for the district. Evaluations are expected to be in place on schedule with grant requirements that will be developed with input from a committee of both district and union representatives. At the present time, a model evaluation system was developed and there are plans to develop a committee. The evaluation system is unable to provide feedback and supports.

The narrative includes a working definition of professional development to enhance professional growth, stating that all district staff will acquire or enhance the knowledge, skills, and expectations necessary to increase student achievement. The elements listed include organizing into Data Teams with goals aligned to school and district, providing educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate, and deepening educators' content knowledge. There is no indication if there is any variance, any more specific or unique information that might inform this listing if it were limited to the participant schools representing just grades 6-10.

The applicant's plan does not address an approach for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from either effective or highly effective teachers or principals at any sites or in any schools.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	1

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Each of the schools within the school district, according to the narrative, will be given the flexibility and autonomy to effect the necessary improvements. This very limited autonomy includes only the development of a curriculum pacing calendar. The flexibility and autonomy do not extend to practices that typically support personalized learning, including student schedules, budgets, and personnel decisions.

The proposal does not address other practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning, including: (a) organizing the district's central office to provide services to the participant schools, (b) giving students the opportunity to progress and early credit based on demonstrated mastery at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways, and not on the amount of time spent on a topic, and (c) providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative does not adequately address this criterion. The response first focuses on district support through external entities (The Mayor's Education Roundtable and The Friends of the Montebello Unified School District). It follows with district and school infrastructure supports of personalized learning professional learning, but only that of district educators rather than on the full complement of students, parents and teachers. A discussion of access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources for parents is not available, including information addressing the accessibility to technical support. Student access to support strategies (additional periods, double-core content classes, etc) is available. Partnerships through organizations (including community centers, higher education institutions and public libraries) have been established to provide students with additional time to become proficient with technology.

The proposal does not address how district infrastructure will use information technology systems that will allow parents and students to export their information to use in other electronic learning systems nor does it ensure the interoperability of data systems between the participant schools and the district.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides an unclear picture of the district's strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement

process and the extent of that process. Two components of the new plan would focus on teacher professional development and the expansion of programs already in use (i.e. Read 180, English 3D). The process to guide their continuous improvement is an analysis of disaggregated data at the school level that then informs the site and department's SMART goals.

The improvement planning process, as subsequently laid out, explains a sequence of setting strategic goals, establishing leadership teams, and conducting needs assessment through the analysis of data. This sequence indicates that the goals are not informed by the needs assessment and the data analysis. Monitoring and evaluation are key elements within the process. The narrative notes that evaluation is conducted quarterly, but no specifics are provided as to what data is collected and analyzed at that time.

The improvement process moves from the site Data Teams to the district office for further analysis and to reveal possible wider patterns or trends. Reports will be generated back to participant schools.

No information is shared concerning how any improvement process and its results, monitoring and measuring the quality of the Race to the Top-District investments, will be publicly shared.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	**5**	**0**

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strategies for ongoing communications and engagement were not addressed.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The performance measures are not clearly marked to show rationale and how the measure will provide key information to inform the overall theory of action for the applicant's plan. No details are offered as to how any individual measure will be reviewed to replace or improve it if it is not useful in determining progress for students.

In many cases, the performance measures show regular incremental increases every year for every subgroup in every content or performance area. No explanation is provided on a formula for expected growth in enrollment or success.

The applicant selected attendance as one health, social-emotional leading indicator performance measure for both grades 6-8 and 9-10. No rationale was provided for this selection. For both groups of students, baseline data showed attendance already surpassing 94% in all student subgroups (range of 94.61 to 97.08). Over the four year grant plus the addition post-grant year, the goals for each year increased an average of .02 so that, by the 5th year the range shows 94.72 to 97.18, a .1 increase. Achievable but not ambitious.

The proposal includes an adequate number of performance measures and they cover all of the grade levels of the participant schools (6-10).

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	**5**	**0**

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal does not respond to the criterion that requests plans to evaluate the effectives of grant-funded activities and to more productively use resources to improve results.

The narrative does address the new Smarter Balance student assessment that will incorporate the Common Core State Standards and the alignment of professional development to both.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	**10**	**8**

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A budget is included that reflects all four program years with supporting summaries by projects. Only Race to the Top-District funds will be used to fund the program. Costs included in the budget are reasonable and sufficient but they are intended to support all students in the district - not just students at participating schools and in participating grade levels. One-time costs will be used for equipment and for professional development to use that equipment. Other professional development (content

areas, for example) continues throughout the grant cycle.

Individual budgets list an indirect cost of 3.49% but the calculation (and the approved rate) is at 4.39%.

The individual budget narratives provide appropriate levels of detail to understand the costs and why the expenditure is necessary for the project.

No budget is included to cover expenditures at the district level, including evaluation and analysis of data from Data Teams at the school level, staff time and effort in report writing and program oversight, and secretarial support.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's sustainability plan is limited to two primary areas: (a) the identification of two sources of financial support: Federal and State Categorical entitlements ($10 million) and the Friends of Montebello Unified School District Foundation, and (b) commitments by the district. The district will agree to support the technology infrastructure.

No details are provided as to whether the entitlement funding is eligible to cover many of the costs involved in the 11 projects within the plan, including the salaries of 35 teachers.   The proposal does not include any additional potential sources of income, such as partnerships with businesses, higher education, or the pursuit of additional discretionary grant funds or foundation support.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not submit for Competitive Preference Priority consideration.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Montebello Unified School District presents a plan to create learning environments across participant middle- and high-schools that will reflect new, teacher developed curriculum to personalize the learning experience and increase college- and career-readiness for students. The plan builds on core assurance areas such as Common Core Standards and includes in its performance measures high school graduation and college and career preparation readiness.

Total	210	101